

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicant acknowledges, with thanks, receipt of the Office Action that was mailed on May 8, 2007. This amendment is responsive to the May 8, 2007 Office Action. Claims 1, 17 and 24 have been amended. Claim 25 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 27 is new. The subject matter of using asymmetric encryption to establish a tunnel to acquire the protected access credential is not new matter as it is disclosed in paragraphs 71, 75, 98 and 139-140 of the original specification (*cf.* reference char's 615, 620, 625, 630, 635, 640, 645, 650 of Fig. 6).

The applicant would also like to thank the examiner for the telephone interview of August 3, 2007. A substance of the interview follows. The interview was conducted by telephone. The participants were the applicant's representative, the undersigned, and the examiner. No exhibits or demonstrations were presented. Claim 1 and the Funk and Schneier references, which will be described in further detail herein below, were discussed. No agreement was reached.

NON-ART MATTERS

Claims 1, 17, 20 and 24-26 were objected to for the following informalities. Claim 1 for reciting "establishing a secure tunnel between the first party and the second party using the comprising mutually" and for ending with "within the secure tunnel using." Claims 17 and 20 for referring to the "shared credential or the "first secure credential." Claims 24-26 for using wireless client and wireless device interchangeably. Accordingly, these claims have been amended to correct the informalities and withdrawal of the objections is requested.

PRIOR ART MATTERS

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12 14-21 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Funk (Paul Funk, Simon Blake Wilson; "draft-ietf-ppext-eap-ttls-02.txt: Tunneled TLS Authentication Protocol (EAP-TTLS)" ; Internet-Draft PPEXT Working Group; 30 Nov.2002, pp. 1-40). Claims 5-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in

view of the combination of Funk and Schneier (Schneier, Bruce, "Applied Cryptography", second edition 1996, pp. 151-157 and 566-571). For reasons that will now be set forth, the claims as currently amended are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of Funk and/or Schneier when considered alone or in combination.

Independent claims 1, 17 and 24, as now amended, recite that a wireless client establishes a secure tunnel via asymmetric encryption with a server to acquire a shared secret. The shared secret is employed to establish one (or more – claim 27) subsequent secure tunnels using symmetric encryption. Tunnel keys may also be derived via the shared secret. Authentication is then performed via the subsequent secure tunnels.

By contrast, Funk only uses asymmetric encryption to establish the secure tunnels for authentication. Funk discloses using a PKI architecture, which necessitates third party servers, and computational overhead for every authentication; whereas claims 1, 17 and 24 employ a shared secret that was separately provisioned. The examiner relies on Schneier (Kerberos) for acquiring a pre-shared secret to enable symmetric encryption to be employed to establish communication between devices. However, Schneier sends a 'ticket' to a client encrypted by the client's secret key (Schneier, p. 567). Thus, neither Funk nor Schneier, when taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest using asymmetric encryption to establish a secure tunnel to acquire a shared secret, and then employing the shared secret to establish subsequent secure tunnels using symmetric encryption. Thus, neither Funk nor Schneier, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1, 17 and 24.

Claims 2-12, 14-16 and 27 directly depend from claims 1 and therefore contain each and every element of claim 1. Claims 18-21 directly depend from claim 17 and therefore contain each and every element of claim 17. Claim 26 directly depends from claim 24 and therefore contains each and every element of claim 24. Therefore, claims 2-12, 14-16, 18-21 and 26-27 are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of Funk and/or Schneier for the reason already set forth for claims 1, 17 and 24.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons just set forth, the applicant requests withdrawal of the objections and rejections. If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 72255/00010.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 8, 2007



Larry B. Donovan
Registration No. 47,230
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3864
Fax: (216) 592-5009